Table 2-H-6 continued Sacramento to Bakersfield – High-Speed Train Station Evaluation Matrix Sacramento Stations

Station Name = Station Carried Forward

Station Name = Station Eliminated

Evaluation Criteria	Freeport West	Cal Expo Fairgrounds
Maximize Ridership/Revenue Potential. Travel Time	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Length	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Population/Employment Catchment	•	•
Maximize Connectivity and Accessibility. Intermodal Connections	Suburban location Freeway access: I-5 Florin and Fruitridge ramps ca. 2 miles Street access: Arterial access from Freeport Bl and Blair Av. Parking adequate at site. Transit: Bus access only.	Suburban location Freeway access: I-80 Business ½ mi Transit: Bus ca ½ mi No rail access.
Minimize Operating and Capital Costs.		O
Length	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Operational Issues	Unused right-of-way at present.	Not on any existing rail route.

Evaluation Criteria	Evennert West	Cal Expo Fairgrounds
Construction Issues	Freeport West	
Construction Issues	Possible flooding issues.	Flood danger high. New bridge needed over American River
	•	0
Capital Cost	\$110 million Moderate costs	\$110 million plus. Unassessed, but floodplain mitigation relatively high cost item.
		•
Right-of-Way Issues/Cost	Existing city-owned land and railroad right-of-way	Need for new alignment. Shared use with Cal Expo.
	•	0
Maximize Compatibility with Existing and	Planned Development.	
Land Use Compatibility and Conflicts		
Percent of Conflicting Existing Land Uses (Residences, Institutions, Recreational Areas, and Open Space) within Station Area	78.45	
Primary Land Uses (acreage) within station area	Institutional (40); Residential (254); Transportation (49)	
	•	
Visual Quality Impacts		
Percent of Visually Sensitive Existing Land Uses (Residential, Institutional, Recreational Areas, and Open Space)	78.45	
Number of scenic corridor and scenic river crossings	0	
	•	
Water Resources Impacts		
Number of Natural Stream	0	
Number of Wetland Crossings	0	
Total Acreage of Wetlands within Station Area	0	

Evaluation Critoria	Francisk Work	Cal Expo
Evaluation Criteria	Freeport West	Fairgrounds
Floodplain Impacts		
Number of FEMA Floodplain Crossings	1	
Total Acreage of FEMA Floodplain Crossings within Station Area	404.70	
Threatened & Endangered Species Impacts		
Count of Species	0	
Acreage of Sensitive Habitat within Station Area	0	
Minimize Impacts on Social and Economic	Resources.	
Environmental Justice Impacts (Demographics)		
Minority Within 1,400' Buffer – 1990 Population	2696	
Low Income Within 1,400' Buffer – 1990 Households	0	
	•	
Farmland Impacts		
Total Acreage of Important Farmlands Within Station Area (Prime, Unique, and Statewide Importance)	0	
Minimize Impacts on Cultural Resources.		
Cultural Resources Impacts		
Number of National Register Resources Within Station Area	0	

Evaluation Criteria	Freeport West	Cal Expo Fairgrounds
Parks & Recreation/Wildlife Refuge Impacts		
Count of Parks/Recreation Areas	1	***************************************
Total Acreage Parks/Recreation Areas in Station Area	9.91	
	•	
Maximize Avoidance of Areas with Geologic	c and Soils Constraints.	
Soils/Slope Constraints		
Not a Distinguishing Factor		
Seismic Constraints		
Not a Distinguishing Factor		
Hazardous Materials/Waste Constraints		
Not a Distinguishing Factor		







Table 2-H-7 Sacramento to Bakersfield – High-Speed Train Alignment Evaluation Matrix Stockton to Modesto Alignment

Alignment = Alignment Carried Forward

Alignment = Alignment Eliminated

	Express Loop/BNSF	Express Loop/UPRR	W99
Evaluation Criteria	(Downtown Stockton to	(Downtown Stockton to	(Downtown Stockton to
	Modesto Briggsmore)	Downtown Modesto)	Modesto West)
Maximize Ridership/Revenue Potential.			
Travel Time	VHS 11.6 minutes	VHS 11.4 minutes	VHS 12.6 minutes
	0	•	•
Length	31.424 miles 50.571 km	30.653 49.331 km	34.985 miles 56.303 km
	•	•	•
Population/Employment Catchment	Not Applicable		
Maximize Connectivity and Accessibility.			
Intermodal Connections	*See Modesto Briggsmore Station Option	*See Modesto Downtown Station Option	*See Modesto West Station Option
	•	•	Ο
Minimize Operating and Capital Costs.			
Length	Route meanders	Route meanders	Route meanders
	•	•	
Operational Issues	Diverges from UP and ACE alignment, travels on new alignment, merges with BNSF alignment.	Diverges from UP and ACE alignment, travels on new alignment, merges with UP alignment.	Diverges from UP and ACE alignment, travels on new alignment.
	•	•	•



	Express Loop/BNSF	Express Loop/UPRR	W99
Evaluation Criteria	(Downtown Stockton to	(Downtown Stockton to	(Downtown Stockton to
	Modesto Briggsmore)	Downtown Modesto)	Modesto West)
Construction Issues	Downtown location and grade separations, esp. rail crossings south of the Downtown Stockton station. Water table in Delta floodplain. New urban ROW.	Downtown location and grade separations, especially rail crossings south of the Downtown Stockton station. Water table issues in floodplain of Delta. New urban right-of-way first 10 miles.	Downtown location and grade separations, especially rail crossings south of Downtown Stockton station. Water table issues in floodplain of Delta. New urban right-of-way first 10 miles.
		•	
Capital Cost	Moderate to high cost because of Stockton Downtown costs.	Moderate cost. Downtown costs in Stockton	Moderate cost. Downtown costs in Stockton
	•	•	•
Right-of-Way Issues/Cost	New urban alignment New alignment BNSF upgrade	New urban alignment New alignment UP upgrade	New urban alignment New alignment
	•	•	•
Maximize Compatibility with Existing and	d Planned Development.		
Land Use Compatibility and Conflicts	,		
Percent of Conflicting Existing Land Uses within adjacent buffers (Residences, Institutions, Recreation, Parks, and Open Space)	9.25	13.31	8.33
	•	0	•
Visual Quality Impacts			
Scenic Corridor and River Crossings	3.00	3.00	4.00
	•		



Evaluation Criteria	Express Loop/BNSF (Downtown Stockton to Modesto Briggsmore)	Express Loop/UPRR (Downtown Stockton to Downtown Modesto)	W99 (Downtown Stockton to Modesto West)
Minimize Impacts on Natural Resources.	Modesto Briggsmore)	Downtown Modesto)	Modesto West)
Water Resources Impacts	*Alignment adjacent to existing rail right- of-way		*Impacts on "new corridor"
Number of Natural Stream/Lake Crossings (linear ft)	10.00 (500)	5.00 (250)	11.00 (550)
Number of Wetland Crossings	3.00	2.00	3.00
Total Acreage of Wetlands Within ROW	3.61	0.37	1.81
	0		\circ
Floodplain Impacts	*Alignment adjacent to existing rail right- of-way		*Impacts on "new corridor"
Number of FEMA Floodplain Crossings	9.00	3.00	11.00
Associated Length (meters) of Floodplain Crossings	6741.69	1002.95	7314.69
Total Acreage of FEMA Floodplain Crossings	43.97	7.04	48.45
	0		\circ
Threatened & Endangered Species Impacts			
Count of Species w/in ROW	6.00	5.00	5.00
Count of Species along ROW	6.00	7.00	0.00
Sensitive Habitat Acreage w/in ROW	0.00	2.00	0.00
Net Sensitive Habitat Acreage along ROW	0.00	0.00	
		\circ	
Minimize Impacts on Social and Economi	ic Resources.		
Environmental Justice Impacts (Demographics)			
Minority Within 1,400' Buffer – 1990 Population	20449.00	19138.00	17917.00
Low Income Within 1,400' Buffer – 1990 Households	134.00	196.00	134.00
	0	$\overline{\bigcirc}$	



Evaluation Criteria	Express Loop/BNSF (Downtown Stockton to	Express Loop/UPRR (Downtown Stockton to	W99 (Downtown Stockton to
Evaluation enteria	Modesto Briggsmore)	Downtown Modesto)	Modesto West)
Farmland Impacts	*Alignment adjacent to existing rail right- of-way	*Alignment adjacent to existing rail right-of-way	*Impacts on "new corridor"
Total Acreage of Important Farmlands Within ROW (Prime, Unique, and Statewide Importance)	219.51	204.29	267.16
			\bigcirc
Minimize Impacts on Cultural Resources.			
Cultural Resources Impacts			
Number of National Register Resources Within ROW	0.00	0.00	0.00
Number of National Register Resources along ROW	0.00	0.00	0.00
Parks & Recreation/Wildlife Refuge Impacts			
Total Acreage Parks/Recreation Areas in ROW	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total Acreage of Parks/Recreation Areas along ROW	2.12	0.21	1.82
Incidences of Parks/Recreation Areas in ROW	0.00	0.00	0.00
Incidences of Parks/Recreation Areas along ROW	3.00	1.00	2.00
Maximize Avoidance of Areas with Geolog	gic and Soils Constraints.		<u> </u>
Soils/Slope Constraints			
Not a Distinguishing Factor			
Seismic Constraints			
Not a Distinguishing Factor			
Maximize Avoidance of Areas with Potent	ial Hazardous Materials.		
Hazardous Materials/Waste Constraints			
Not a Distinguishing Factor			









Table 2-H-8 Sacramento to Bakersfield – High-Speed Train Station Evaluation Matrix Stockton to Modesto Stations

Station = Station Carried Forward

Station = Station Eliminated

Maximize Ridership/Revenue Potential. Travel Time Length	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
		1101	Not Applicable
Length			
	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Population/Employment Catchment			
	•	•	
Maximize Connectivity and Accessibility.			
Intermodal Connections	 Outlying location. Freeway access: ¼ mile from 99 Fwy on SR 4 Street access: Distant from Stockton proper. Parking: unconstrained Transit: No service at present Other rail: Amtrak considering a consolidated Stockton station at site; if built, a good transfer station for East Bay destinations via San Joaquin 	 Downtown location. Freeway access: SR 4 Crosstown freeway, then to I-5 and 99 Fwy, via city streets. Street access: on central city street grid. Parking: ample land opportunity in vicinity Transit: On city bus routes Other rail: shares site with ACE commuter rail station, present Amtrak San Joaquin to Sacramento 	 Outlying location. Freeway access: Distant via county road. Street access: Distant from central Stockton, access via Airport Way. Parking: unconstrained, shared with airport Transit: Airport bus to city. Other rail: Airport: connects to limited commercial flights Airport ground facilities: rental car agencies
	0		O
Minimize Operating and Capital Costs.			
Length	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable

Evaluation Criteria	Farmington Road	Downtown ACE	Stockton Airport
Operational Issues	On stopping track alignment Railroad interaction: along BNSF r-o-w, normal coordination	On stopping track alignment Railroad interaction: just north of level crossing of BNSF and UP main lines in Valley. Coordination with ACE terminal operations at station site.	 On stopping track alignment Railroad interaction: just south of level crossing of BNSF and UP mainlines in Valley. Airport interaction: location must be coordinated to avoid clear zones of airport.
	•	\circ	•
Construction Issues	Relatively straightforward, open-field construction at station. Approach track must cross 99 Fwy on long structure.	Must be elevated or depressed through most of city, especially downtown, to coexist with street grid and with congested freight railroads to the south of site. Aerial alignment must contend with 4 Fwy, trench alignment must contend with water table issues.	Station relatively straightforward, except for aviation constraints. Station stopping track uses same alignment as downtown station, must resolve all same issues.
	•	0	\circ
Capital Cost	Moderate.	High, due to central urban location and rail interaction issues.	Moderate at station site. Approach alignments more challenging.
	•	0	O
Right-of-Way Issues/Cost	Follows BNSF r-o-w.	City may use redevelopment powers to enhance land assembly and cost.	All new r-o-w to reach site.
	•	•	0
Maximize Compatibility with Existing and	Planned Development.		
Land Use Compatibility and Conflicts			
Percent of Conflicting Existing Land Uses (Residences, Institutions, Recreational Areas, and Open Space) within Station Area	17.98	54.61	16.18
Primary Land Uses (acreage) within station area	Farmland/Agriculture (158); Industrial (255); Residential (90)	Commercial (107); Industrial (72); Institutional (104); Mixed Use (50); Residential (148)	Farmland/Agriculture (422); Institutional (81)
	•	0	•



Evaluation Criteria	Farmington Road	Downtown ACE	Stockton Airport
Visual Quality Impacts			
Percent of Visually Sensitive Existing Land Uses (Residential, Institutional, Recreational Areas, and Open Space)	17.98	54.61	16.18
Number of scenic corridor and scenic river crossings	0	0	0
	0	0	•
Minimize Impacts on Natural Resources. Water Resources Impacts			
Number of Natural Stream	2	0	1
Number of Wetland Crossings Total Acreage of Wetlands within Station Area	2 1.03	0 0	0
	\circ		
Floodplain Impacts			
Number of FEMA Floodplain Crossings Total Acreage of FEMA Floodplain Crossings within Station Area	4 6.81	0	2 289.85
	0		O
Threatened & Endangered Species Impacts			
Count of Species	1	0	0
Acreage of Sensitive Habitat within Station Area	0	0	0



Evaluation Criteria	Farmington Road	Downtown ACE	Stockton Airport
Minimize Impacts on Social and Economic	c Resources.		_
Environmental Justice Impacts (Demographics)			
Minority Within 1,400' Buffer – 1990 Population Low Income Within 1,400' Buffer – 1990 Households	0	7172 134	2036
	•		
Farmland Impacts			
Total Acreage of Important Farmlands Within Station Area (Prime, Unique, and Statewide Importance)	277.51	0	503.02
***************************************	0		O
Minimize Impacts on Cultural Resources.			-
Cultural Resources Impacts			
Number of National Register Resources Within Station Area	0	2	0
		0	
Parks & Recreation/Wildlife Refuge Impacts			
Count of Parks/Recreation Areas	0	1	0
Total Acreage Parks/Recreation Areas in Station Area	0	2.96	0
		0	



Evaluation Criteria	Farmington Road	Downtown ACE	Stockton Airport
Maximize Avoidance of Areas with Geolog	ic and Soils Constraints.		
Soils/Slope Constraints			
Not a Distinguishing Factor			
Not a Distinguishing Factor			
Seismic Constraints			
Not a Distinguishing Factor			
Maximize Avoidance of Areas with Potenti	ial Hazardous Materials.		
Hazardous Materials/Waste Constraints	ar riazar a o do matoriais.		
Not a Distinguishing Factor			

Least Favorable

Table 2-H-9 Sacramento to Bakersfield – High-Speed Train Alignment Evaluation Matrix Modesto to Merced Alignment

Alignment = Alignment Carried Forward

Alignment = Alignment Eliminated

Evaluation Criteria	BNSF (Modesto Briggsmore to Downtown Merced)	W99 (Modesto West to Merced Municipal Airport)	UPRR (Downtown Modesto to Downtown Merced)	E99 (Modesto Briggsmore to Merced University)
Maximize Ridership/Revenue Potential.				
Travel Time	VHS 13.6 minutes	VHS 14.4 minutes	VHS 13.5 minutes	VHS 12.9 minutes
	•	•	•	•
Length	37.42 miles 60.22 km	40.2 miles 64.6 km	37.04 miles 59.60 km	34.60 miles 55.68 km
			•	
Population/Employment Catchment	*See Modesto Briggsmore (Amtrak) Station option	*See Modesto West Station option	*See Downtown Modesto Station option	*See Modesto East Station option
		•	•	
Maximize Connectivity and Accessibility.				
Intermodal Connections	*See Modesto Briggsmore (Amtrak) Station option	*See Modesto West Station option	*See Downtown Modesto Station option	*See Modesto East Station option
		0	•	
Minimize Operating and Capital Costs.	-			
Length	Short but more urban construction	Longer than other options but all new right-of-way	Short but more urban construction	Short and low cost
Operational Issues	Mostly BNSF with new ROW link to Downtown Merced	New right-of-way	UP Freight coordination	New alignment most of the route
Construction Issues	Freight and Amtrak coordination	New right-of-way	UP coordination	Freight coordination Amtrak coordination
			•	•
Capital Cost	Moderate to high cost	High cost	High cost	Moderate cost
	•	•	O	0

Evaluation Criteria	BNSF (Modesto Briggsmore to Downtown Merced)	W99 (Modesto West to Merced Municipal Airport)	UPRR (Downtown Modesto to Downtown Merced)	E99 (Modesto Briggsmore to Merced University)	
Right-of-Way Issues/Cost	BNSF r/w and new r/w link to Downtown Merced	New ROW	UP ROW	Mostly new alignment	
	0	•			
Maximize Compatibility with Existing and	Planned Development.				
Land Use Compatibility and Conflicts					
Percent of Conflicting Existing Land Uses within adjacent buffers (Residences, Institutions, Recreation, Parks, and Open Space)	8.36	7.73	12.33	6.38	
			\circ		
Visual Quality Impacts					
Scenic Corridor and River Crossings	2.00	1.00	1.00	3.00	
Minimize Impacts on Natural Resources.	•			•	
Water Resources Impacts					
Number of Natural Stream/Lake Crossings (linear ft)	6.00 (300)	5.00 (250)	4.00 (200)	8.00 (400)	
Number of Wetland Crossings	4.00	7.00	3.00	9.00	
Total Acreage of Wetlands Within ROW	1.46	2.12	0.38	4.19	
				•	
Floodplain Impacts					
Number of FEMA Floodplain Crossings	8.00	3.00	5.00	5.00	
Associated Length (meters) of Floodplain Crossings	8987.31	7298.04	6828.69	2461.15	
Total Acreage of FEMA Floodplain Crossings	50.40	54.88	44.93	18.51	
Threatened & Endangered Species Impacts					
Count of Species w/in ROW	1.00	0.00	3.00	2.00	
Count of Species along ROW	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	
Sensitive Habitat Acreage w/in ROW	0.00	0.00	0.00	9.08	
Net Sensitive Habitat Acreage along ROW	0.00	0.00	0.00	27.79	
				•	



Evaluation Criteria	BNSF (Modesto Briggsmore to Downtown Merced)	W99 (Modesto West to Merced Municipal Airport)	UPRR (Downtown Modesto to Downtown Merced)	E99 (Modesto Briggsmore to Merced University)
Minimize Impacts on Social and Economic	c Resources.		,	
Environmental Justice Impacts (Demographics)				
Minority Within 1,400' Buffer – 1990 Population	7786.00	8316.00	19562.00	3926.00
Low Income Within 1,400' Buffer – 1990 Households	0.00	0.00	121.00	0.00
			\bigcirc	
Farmland Impacts	*Low severance issues for alignment adjacent to existing rail r/w	* High severance impacts with "new" corridor	*Low severance issues for alignment adjacent to existing rail r/w	* High severance impacts with "new" corridor
Total Acreage of Important Farmlands Within ROW (Prime, Unique, and Statewide Importance)	199.83	422.39	145.83	296.41
		\cup		
Cultural Resources Impacts				
Number of National Register Resources Within ROW	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Number of National Register Resources along ROW	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Parks & Recreation/Wildlife Refuge Impacts				
Total Acreage Parks/Recreation Areas in ROW	14.26	1.70	11.90	0.00
Total Acreage of Parks/Recreation Areas along ROW	42.83	11.93	32.85	0.00
Incidences of Parks/Recreation Areas in ROW	1.00	2.00	2.00	0.00
Incidences of Parks/Recreation Areas along ROW	1.00	0.00	3.00	0.00
Maximize Avoidance of Areas with Geolog	nic and Soils Constraints.			
Soils/Slope Constraints				
Not a Distinguishing Factor				
Seismic Constraints				
Not a Distinguishing Factor				
		1		<u> </u>

BNSF Evaluation Criteria (Modesto Briggsmore to Downtown Merced)		W99 (Modesto West to Merced Municipal Airport)	UPRR (Downtown Modesto to Downtown Merced)	E99 (Modesto Briggsmore to Merced University)
Maximize Avoidance of Areas with Potenti	ial Hazardous Materials.			
Hazardous Materials/Waste Constraints				
Not a Distinguishing Factor				

Least Favorable

Table 2-H-10 Sacramento to Bakersfield – High-Speed Train Station Evaluation Matrix Modesto to Merced Stations

Station = Station Carried Forward

Station = Station Eliminated

Evaluation Criteria	Modesto Amtrak -Briggsmore	Modesto Empire	Modesto SP Downtown	Modesto West	Modesto East
Maximize Ridership/Revenue Potential.					
Travel Time	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Length	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Population/Employment Catchment					
		•			
Maximize Connectivity and Accessibility.					
Intermodal Connections	Suburban location Freeway access: distant from 99 Fwy Street access: off Briggsmore Rd, an arterial hwy in northeastern part of city Parking: ample land opportunity in vicinity, shared use with Amtrak Transit: served by MAX buses Other rail: Site of new Amtrak station. Potential transfer point for Amtrak San Joaquin service to the East Bay area.	opportunity in vicinity Transit: served by MAX buses Other rail: none	two blocks of 99 Fwy at Central Modesto exit Street access: on downtown street grid with considerable traffic congestion Parking: highly constrained in central core of city and on site. Transit: Existing SP Depot is MAX central transfer hub and transportation center. Other rail: none currently, possible future ACE extension	Outlying location Freeway access: distant from 99 Fwy Street access: on SR 132, Maze Blvd, a busy farm to market road Parking: unconstrained Transit: none Other rail: none	
	•	•	•	O	0



Evaluation Criteria	Modesto Amtrak -Briggsmore	Modesto Empire	Modesto SP Downtown	Modesto West	Modesto East
Minimize Operating and Capital Costs.					
Length	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Operational Issues	Stopping track alignment Railroad interaction: Along BNSF r-o-w, normal coordination Amtrak coordination necessary and mutually beneficial	Stopping track alignment Railroad interaction: Along BNSF r-o-w, normal coordination. Also junction with short line freight rail feeders, with much BNSF interchange activity	Stopping track alignment Railroad interaction: Along UP r-o-w, normal coordination. Constrained operating environment through central Modesto	Through track alignment Railroad interaction: none, new alignment Through track alignment	
	•	•	•	•	•
Construction Issues	Transfer station with Amtrak requires architectural and logistical care. Otherwise relatively straightforward construction.	Once ATSF Modesto station site. Appropriate site for HSR station straightforward. Alignment of HSR not to impede freight interchange may be complex, but manageable.	Site is narrow. Coexistence with historic depot an architectural and logistical challenge. Many grade separations throughout central city.	Standard intermediate station design.	None; open land.
			lacksquare		
Capital Cost	Moderate	Station costs moderate, access roadways and intersection solutions costly	Expected to be expensive, especially track approaches and grade separations.	Moderate to low.	Low; open site.
			lacksquare		
Right-of-Way Issues/Cost	Along BNSF, adequate r- o-w present for additional HSR presence	Along BNSF, adequate r-o- w present for additional HSR presence. Appropriate alignment for HSR to be determined.	Land assembly for station and facilities may be complicated.	Open agricultural land on new alignment.	Farmland issues but not developed. Low cost.
			•		



Evaluation Criteria	Modesto Amtrak -Briggsmore	Modesto Empire	Modesto SP Downtown	Modesto West	Modesto East
Maximize Compatibility with Existing and Pi	lanned Development.				
Land Use Compatibility and Conflicts					
Percent of Conflicting Existing Land Uses (Residences, Institutions, Recreational Areas, and Open Space) within Station Area	1.72	47.19	22.73	0	0
Primary Land Uses (acreage) within station area	Farmland/Agriculture (175); Mixed Use (141); Office (164)	Commercial (70); Farmland/Agriculture (74); Institutional (91); Residential (237)	Mixed Use (389); Residential (114)	Farmland /Agriculture (503)	Farmland/Agriculture (503.02)
		\bigcirc			
Visual Quality Impacts			, and the second		
Percent of Visually Sensitive Existing Land Uses (Residential, Institutional, Recreational Areas, and Open Space)	1.72	47.19	22.73	0	0
Number of scenic corridor and scenic river crossings	1	0	0	0	1
	•				
Minimize Impacts on Natural Resources. Water Resources Impacts					
Number of Natural Stream	1	0	0	0	1
Number of Wetland Crossings	1	0	0	0	0
Total Acreage of Wetlands within Station Area	2.09	0	0	0	0
Floodplain Impacts					
Number of FEMA Floodplain Crossings	1	0	0	0	
Total Acreage of FEMA Floodplain Crossings within Station Area	2.64	0	0	0	9.19
	•				



Evaluation Criteria	Modesto Amtrak -Briggsmore	Modesto Empire	Modesto SP Downtown	Modesto West	Modesto East
Threatened & Endangered Species Impacts					
Count of Species	1	1	11	1	0
Acreage of Sensitive Habitat within Station Area	0	0	0	0	0
Minimize Impacts on Social and Economic R	Resources.				
Environmental Justice Impacts (Demographics)					
Minority Within 1,400' Buffer – 1990 Population Low Income Within 1,400' Buffer – 1990 Households	0	0	5100 158	0	0
Low Income Within 1,400 Burier – 1770 Households	•				
Farmland Impacts					
Total Acreage of Important Farmlands Within Station Area (Prime, Unique, and Statewide Importance)	225.09	116.23	0	502.15	0
	•	•	•	\bigcirc	•
Minimize Impacts on Cultural Resources.					
Cultural Resources Impacts					
Number of National Register Resources Within Station Area	0	0	1	0	0
			lacksquare		
Parks & Recreation/Wildlife Refuge Impacts					
Count of Parks/Recreation Areas	0	0	1	0	0
Total Acreage Parks/Recreation Areas in Station Area	0	0	0.70	0	0
			•		



Evaluation Criteria	Modesto Amtrak -Briggsmore	Modesto Empire	Modesto SP Downtown	Modesto West	Modesto East		
Maximize Avoidance of Areas with Geologic	and Soils Constraints.						
Soils/Slope Constraints							
Not a Distinguishing Factor							
Seismic Constraints							
Not a Distinguishing Factor							
	Maximize Avoidance of Areas with Potential Hazardous Materials.						
Hazardous Materials/Waste Constraints							
Not a Distinguishing Factor							

Least Favorable



Table 2-H-11 Sacramento to Bakersfield – High-Speed Train Station Evaluation Matrix Merced to Fresno Stations

Statiom = Station Carried Forward

Alignment = Station Eliminated

=

Evaluation Criteria	Castle	Merced University	Merced Municipal Airport	Merced UPRR Downtown	Plainsburg			
Maximize Ridership/Revenue Poteri	rtial.							
Travel Time	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable			
Length	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable			
Population/Employment Catchment								
	•	•	•	•	•			
Maximize Connectivity and Accessing	bility.							
Intermodal Connections	 Suburban location for Merced, closer, to central Atwater Freeway access: SR 99 ca 3 miles Arterial access: Santa Fe Avenue (J7), planned Bellevue Expressway, ca. 1 mile Parking adequate at site Transit bus and shuttle foreseeable in future No Amtrak connection 	 New suburban site in future University planned area Freeway access: via planned expressway, about 3 miles Street access: New Bellevue expressway, in planning. Parking adequate in future design. Transit: feasible in future. Other rail: possible future LRT. 	Suburban location. Freeway access: SR 99 ca. 1 mile Street access: local streets only Parking adequate at location Transit: bus only Other rail: none	 Downtown location. Freeway access: SR 99 2 blocks Street access: local downtown grid Parking: may be constrained at site Transit: Hub for Merced County transit system Other rail: none 	 Downtown site in small community Freeway access: distant Street access: local roads Parking: adequate at site Transit: bus only Other rail: no Amtrak connection 			
	•	•	•	•	0			
, , ,	Minimize Operating and Capital Costs.							
Length	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable			



Evaluation Criteria	Castle	Merced University	Merced Municipal Airport	Merced UPRR Downtown	Plainsburg
Operational Issues	High-speed track off BNSF or E99. Station can serve all alignments to south.	Newly designed high-speed track in new community.	High-speed track off SP or W99. Station can serve all alignments from north, SP or W99 alignments to south.	Constrained urban r-o-w. Stopping track configuration only. Freight compatibility issues.	On existing BNSF line. High-speed track requires relaying curves in settled area.
	•		•	0	•
Construction Issues	No outstanding issues. Must coordinate with airport and local authorities, including new UC campus.	Greenfield site.	No outstanding issues.	Urban r-o-w, Narrow freight corridor.	Minimal.
			•	0	•
Capital Cost	Relatively low	Relatively low.	Relatively low.	Relatively high.	Low.
	•	•	•	•	•
Right-of-Way Issues/Cost	Military base reuse. Land owned by local joint powers board.	Must assemble new route in newly zoned urban area.	Industrial area, Airport owned by city.	Existing r-o-w. Must acquire land to fit.	Moderate.
	•	•	•	•	•
Maximize Compatibility with Existing	g and Planned Developm	ent.			
Land Use Compatibility and Conflicts					
Percent of Conflicting Existing Land Uses (Residences, Institutions, Recreational Areas, and Open Space) within Station Area	0.20	16.02	8.59	45.01	14.33
Primary Land Uses (acreage) within station area	Farmland/Agriculture (294); Transportation (207)	Farmland/Agriculture (421); Residential (75)	Farmland/Agriculture (443); Institutional (42)	Commercial (173); Residential (157)	Farmland/Agriculture (396)
		•		0	•



Evaluation Criteria	Castle	Merced University	Merced Municipal Airport	Merced UPRR Downtown	Plainsburg
Visual Quality Impacts					
Percent of Visually Sensitive Existing Land Uses (Residential, Institutional, Recreational Areas, and Open Space)	0.20	16.02	8.59	45.01	14.33
Number of scenic corridor and scenic river crossings	0	0	0	12	0
		•		0	•
Minimize Impacts on Natural Resource.	S.				
Water Resources Impacts					
Number of Natural Stream	0	1	0	0	2
Number of Wetland Crossings	1	4	0	0	2
Total Acreage of Wetlands within Station Area	0.48	44.59	0	0	1.25
	•	O			•
Floodplain Impacts					
Number of FEMA Floodplain Crossings	0		1	2	1
Total Acreage of FEMA Floodplain	0	203.57	503.02	467.39	428.71
Crossings within Station Area					
				•	•
Threatened & Endangered Species Impacts					
Count of Species	0	2	1	1	0
Acreage of Sensitive Habitat within Station Area	30.53	0	0	0	0
	0	•	•		



Evaluation Criteria	Castle	Merced University	Merced Municipal Airport	Merced UPRR Downtown	Plainsburg
Minimize Impacts on Social and Econo	omic Resources.				
Environmental Justice Impacts (Demographics)					
Minority Within 1,400' Buffer – 1990 Population	1963	0	3923	14635	2500
Low Income Within 1,400' Buffer – 1990 Households	0	0	0	0	0
	•		•	0	0
Farmland Impacts					
Total Acreage of Important Farmlands Within Station Area (Prime, Unique, and Statewide Importance)	12.79	157.79	0	0	420.83
	4	O			\circ
Minimize Impacts on Cultural Resource Cultural Resources Impacts	es.				
Number of National Register Resources Within Station Area	0	0	0	7	0
Parks & Recreation/Wildlife Refuge Impacts					
Total Acreage Parks/Recreation Areas in Station Area	0	2	0	13	0
Count of Parks/Recreation Areas	0	1.16	0	23.19	0
		•		O	
Maximize Avoidance of Areas with Geo	ologic and Soils Con	straints.			
Soils/Slope Constraints					
Not a Distinguishing Factor					

Evaluation Criteria	Castle	Merced University	Merced Municipal Airport	Merced UPRR Downtown	Plainsburg
Seismic Constraints					
Not a Distinguishing Factor					
Maximize Avoidance of Areas with I	Potential Hazardous Mate	erials.			
Hazardous Materials/Waste Constraints					
Not a Distinguishing Factor					









Table 2-H-12 Sacramento to Bakersfield – High-Speed Train Alignment Evaluation Matrix Merced to Fresno Alignment

Alignment = Alignment Carried Forward

Alignment = Alignment Eliminated

	UPRR	W99	BNSF	E99
Evaluation Criteria	(Downtown Merced to Downtown Fresno)	(Merced Downtown to Fresno West)	(Downtown Merced to Downtown Fresno)	(Merced Castle to Fresno East)
Maximize Ridership/Revenue Potential.				
Travel Time	VHS 18.5 minutes	VHS 17.6 minutes	VHS 21.0 minutes	VHS 24.0 minutes
		•	0	0
Length	55.30 miles 88.99 km	51.87 miles 83.48 km	57.42 miles 92.4 km	75.32 miles 121.21 km
		0		0
Population/Employment Catchment	*See Fresno Downtown Station option	*See Fresno West Station option	*See Fresno Downtown Station option	*See Fresno East Station option
	•	0	•	
Maximize Connectivity and Accessibility				
Intermodal Connections	*See Fresno Downtown Station option	*See Fresno West Station option	*See Fresno Downtown Station option	*See Fresno East Station option
		O		•
Minimize Operating and Capital Costs.				
Length	Short, but costly through urban areas	Less costly than other options	Less urban area than UP	Longer, goes well to the east of direct route
	0	0	0	•
Operational Issues	SP coordination full length	New alignment SP Merced	BNSF and Amtrak coordination	BNSF and Amtrak coordination
	•	0	•	0
Construction Issues	SP coordination full length Downtown Fresno and Merced	Merced downtown	BNSF/Amtrak coordination	New alignment/BNSF/New BNSF coordination
	•		•	0



Evaluation Criteria	UPRR (Downtown Merced to Downtown Fresno)	W99 (Merced Downtown to Fresno West)	BNSF (Downtown Merced to Downtown Fresno)	E99 (Merced Castle to Fresno East)
Capital Cost	High cost	Low cost	Moderate cost	Moderate cost
Right-of-Way Issues/Cost	SP coordination and cost full length	Merced downtown New ROW	BNSF/Amtrak coordination	New ROW and BNSF
	•		0	0
Maximize Compatibility with Existing and	Planned Development.	l	l	I
Land Use Compatibility and Conflicts				
Percent of Conflicting Existing Land Uses within adjacent buffers (Residences, Institutions, Recreation, Parks, and Open Space)	18.83	23.57	25.11	23.10
	•		•	0
Visual Quality Impacts				
Scenic Corridor and River Crossings	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
	•	•	•	•
Minimize Impacts on Natural Resources.				
Water Resources Impacts				
Number of Natural Stream/Lake Crossings (linear ft)	9.00 (450)	13.00 (650)	23.00 (1,150)	34.00 (1,700)
Number of Wetland Crossings	6.00	18.00	20.00	28.00
Total Acreage of Wetlands Within ROW	4.39	25.18	77.78	82.75



Evaluation Criteria	UPRR (Downtown Merced to Downtown Fresno)	W99 (Merced Downtown to Fresno West)	BNSF (Downtown Merced to Downtown Fresno)	E99 (Merced Castle to Fresno East)
Floodplain Impacts				
Number of FEMA Floodplain Crossings	13.00	18.00	20.00	14.00
Associated Length (meters) of Floodplain Crossings	20558.88	25308.03	15428.81	19050.25
Total Acreage of FEMA Floodplain Crossings	138.01	178.59	104.17	136.50
	0	•	•	0
Threatened & Endangered Species Impacts	-			
Count of Species w/in ROW	2.00	2.00	20.00	19.00
Count of Species along ROW	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Sensitive Habitat Acreage w/in ROW	0.00	38.24	83.52	83.52
Net Sensitive Habitat Acreage along ROW	0.00	121.01	252.10	252.10
		•	O	0
Minimize Impacts on Social and Economic	: Resources.			
Environmental Justice Impacts (Demographics)				
Minority Within 1,400' Buffer – 1990 Population	22376.00	10365.00	20469.00	9149.00
Low Income Within 1,400' Buffer – 1990 Households	209.00	164.00	0.00	0.00
	•		•	
Farmland Impacts				
Total Acreage of Important Farmlands Within ROW (Prime, Unique, and Statewide Importance)	117.18	398.17	319.78	501.10
			•	



Evaluation Criteria	UPRR (Downtown Merced to Downtown Fresno)	W99 (Merced Downtown to Fresno West)	BNSF (Downtown Merced to Downtown Fresno)	E99 (Merced Castle to Fresno East)
Minimize Impacts on Cultural Resources.				
Cultural Resources Impacts				
Number of National Register Resources Within ROW	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Number of National Register Resources along ROW	2.00	1.00	0.00	0.00
Parks & Recreation/Wildlife Refuge Impacts	-	-	-	-
Total Acreage Parks/Recreation Areas in ROW	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.16
Total Acreage of Parks/Recreation Areas along ROW	0.00	0.00	1.01	12.41
Incidences of Parks/Recreation Areas in ROW	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.00
Incidences of Parks/Recreation Areas along ROW	0.00	0.00	2.00	3.00
				O
Maximize Avoidance of Areas with Geolog	ic and Soils Constraints.			
Soils/Slope Constraints				
Not a Distinguishing Factor				
Seismic Constraints				
Not a Distinguishing Factor				
Maximize Avoidance of Areas with Potenti	ial Hazardous Materials.			
Hazardous Materials/Waste Constraints				
Not a Distinguishing Factor				













Table 2-H-13 Sacramento to Bakersfield — High-Speed Train Station Evaluation Matrix Fresno to Tulare Stations

Station = Station Carried Forward

Staion = Station Eliminated

 Freeway access: Good access to SR 99 at several exits. Street access: downtown street grid Parking: may be limited at site Freeway access: Good via SR 99 and SR 180 Street access: Limited local streets Parking adequate at site. Transit: bus only Freeway access: ca. 1 mile to SR 99 Street access: downtown street grid Parking: very limited Transit: buses only Other rail: Current Amtrak 	Evaluation Criteria	Fresno Downtown	Chandler Field	Fresno Amtrak	Fresno Yosemite International Airport
Applicable App	Maximize Ridership/Revenue Potentia	<i>l.</i>			
Population/Employment Catchment Applicable	Travel Time				
Maximize Connectivity and Accessibility. Intermodal Connections Preeway access: Good access to SR 99 at several exits. Street access: downtown street grid Parking: may be limited at site Transit: good connections Amtrak connection with rail consolidation Minimize Operating and Capital Costs. Amtrak Connectivity and Accessibility. Amtrak Connections Amtrak Connections Amtrak Connections Aminimize Operating and Capital Costs. Almost downtown location. Aminest of Aminest downtown location. Aminest of Suburban location. Amile to SR 99 Amile t	Length				
Downtown location.	Population/Employment Catchment				
Intermodal Connections			•	•	•
Intermodal Connections	Maximize Connectivity and Accessibility	ty.	l		
Minimize Operating and Capital Costs. Length Not Not Not Not Not		 Downtown location. Freeway access: Good access to SR 99 at several exits. Street access: downtown street grid Parking: may be limited at site Transit: good connections Amtrak connection with rail 	location. Freeway access: Good via SR 99 and SR 180 Street access: Limited local streets Parking adequate at site. Transit: bus only	 Freeway access: ca. 1 mile to SR 99 Street access: downtown street grid Parking: very limited Transit: buses only Other rail: Current Amtrak station, to be decommissioned after rail 	 Freeway access: SR 180 2 miles, SR 168 about 3 miles Street access: Arterial streets Parking adequate at shared airport facilities. Transit: Airport transit only
Length Not Not Not Not			•	O	•
y	Minimize Operating and Capital Costs.				
	Length				

Evaluation Criteria	Fresno Downtown	Chandler Field	Fresno Amtrak	Fresno Yosemite International Airport
Operational Issues	 Freight rail consolidation may preempt use of some of corridor, limiting space for 4- track HSR station Transfer and interface with Amtrak. Normal interaction with freight RRs. 	 No major issues. Would be stopping track off new W99 alignment. 	Numerous local crossings and slow-speed curves on BNSF line.	No right-of-way feasible to site.
			O	0
Construction Issues	Possible narrow corridor for station with most expansive freight RR consolidation.	Normal aviation coordination required.	Constrained urban site.	Aviation coordination required.
	•	•	O	•
Capital Cost	Relatively high.	Relatively low.	Relatively high because of urban site.	Not assessed. Relatively low.
	•	•	•	•
Right-of-Way Issues/Cost	Availability of r-o-w interdependent with agreement with freight RRs on consolidation. Some city help with acquisition possible.	Assembly of entire new r-o-w required.	Constrained BNSF main line, to be taken out of service as result of rail consolidation.	No rail access possible.
	0	•	O	O
Maximize Compatibility with Existing and	Planned Development.			
Land Use Compatibility and Conflicts				
Percent of Conflicting Existing Land Uses (Residences, Institutions, Recreational Areas, and Open Space) within Station Area	22.78	48.44	45.30	71.01
Primary Land Uses (acreage) within station area	Commercial (158); Industrial (149); Mixed Use (53); Residential (47)	Industrial (44); Residential (184); Transportation (174)	Commercial (102); Industrial (94); Institutional (84); Residential (118)	Industrial (73); Mixed Use (48); Open Space (86); Residential (245)
	•	•		0



Evaluation Criteria	Fresno Downtown	Chandler Field	Fresno Amtrak	Fresno Yosemite International Airport
Visual Quality Impacts				-
Percent of Visually Sensitive Existing Land Uses (Residential, Institutional, Recreational Areas, and Open Space)	22.78	48.44	45.30	71.01
Number of scenic corridor and scenic river crossings	0	0	0	0
	0	O	O	0
Minimize Impacts on Natural Resources.				
Water Resources Impacts				
Number of Natural Stream	0	0	0	0
Number of Wetland Crossings	1	1	1	3
Total Acreage of Wetlands within Station Area	1.22	7.13	2.08	2.95
	•	•	•	
Floodplain Impacts				
Number of FEMA Floodplain Crossings	1	0	1	1
Total Acreage of FEMA Floodplain Crossings within Station Area	265.83	0	235.82	8.02
	0			
Threatened & Endangered Species Impacts				
Count of Species	0	0	0	0
Acreage of Sensitive Habitat within Station Area	0	0	0	0
Minimize Impacts on Social and Economic	Resources.		•	•
Environmental Justice Impacts (Demographics)				
Minority Within 1,400' Buffer – 1990 Population	7358	6368	8893	1139
Low Income Within 1,400' Buffer – 1990 Households	351	0	474	0
-	0	•	0	



Evaluation Criteria	Fresno Downtown	Chandler Field	Fresno Amtrak	Fresno Yosemite International Airport
Farmland Impacts				
Total Acreage of Important Farmlands Within Station Area (Prime, Unique, and Statewide Importance)	0	8.40	0	0
Minimize Impacts on Cultural Resources.	-	-	-	
Cultural Resources Impacts				
Number of National Register Resources Within Station Area	5	0	11	0
	0		0	
Parks & Recreation/Wildlife Refuge Impacts		'		
Total Acreage Parks/Recreation Areas in Station Area	1	4	2	1
Count of Parks/Recreation Areas	0.38	5.77	4.34	4.40
		0	•	•
Maximize Avoidance of Areas with Geolog	ic and Soils Constraints.		•	
Soils/Slope Constraints				
Not a Distinguishing Factor				
Seismic Constraints				
Not a Distinguishing Factor				



Evaluation Criteria	Fresno Downtown	Chandler Field	Fresno Amtrak	Fresno Yosemite International Airport		
Maximize Avoidance of Areas with Potenti	Maximize Avoidance of Areas with Potential Hazardous Materials.					
Hazardous Materials/Waste Constraints						
Net a Diskip or right on Toolay						
Not a Distinguishing Factor						

Least Favorable Most Favorable

Table 2-H-13 continued Sacramento to Bakersfield – High-Speed Train Station Evaluation Matrix Fresno Stations

Alignment = Alignment Carried Forward

Alignment = Alignment Eliminated

Evaluation Criteria	Fresno East	Fresno West
Maximize Ridership/Revenue Potential.		
Travel Time	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Length	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Population/Employment Catchment	O	•
Maximize Connectivity and Accessibility.		
Intermodal Connections	Exurban site. Freeway access: Close to conceptual SR 65 freeway in future. Arterial access via SR 168. No transit access.	Suburban site. Freeway access: distant from SR 99. Arterial access via SR 180 No transit access.
	O	O
Minimize Operating and Capital Costs.		
Length	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Operational Issues	New greenfields site. No major issues, except landside distance from urban area. New greenfields site. New greenfields site.	
Construction Issues	New greenfields site. No major issues.	New greenfields site.

Evaluation Criteria	Fresno East	Fresno West
	•	
Capital Cost	Low	Relatively low.
		•
Right-of-Way Issues/Cost	Open agricultural land on new alignment of freeway.	Open agricultural land on new alignment.
	engriment of freeway.	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
Maximize Compatibility with Existing and	Planned Development.	
Land Use Compatibility and Conflicts		
Percent of Conflicting Existing Land Uses (Residences, Institutions, Recreational Areas, and Open Space) within Station Area	0	0
Primary Land Uses (acreage) within station area	Farmlands/Agriculture (503.02)	Farmlands/Agriculture (503.02)
Visual Quality Impacts		
Percent of Visually Sensitive Existing Land Uses (Residential, Institutional, Recreational Areas, and Open Space)	0	0
Number of scenic corridor and scenic river crossings	0	0
Minimize Impacts on Natural Resources.		
Water Resources Impacts		
Number of Natural Stream	1	0
Number of Wetland Crossings	4	1
Total Acreage of Wetlands within Station Area	11.76	0.41
	O	



Evaluation Criteria	Fresno East	Fresno West
Floodplain Impacts		
Number of FEMA Floodplain Crossings	2	0
Total Acreage of FEMA Floodplain Crossings within Station Area	123.45	0
	•	
Threatened & Endangered Species Impacts		
Count of Species	0	0
Acreage of Sensitive Habitat within Station Area	0	0
Minimize Impacts on Social and Economic	Resources.	
Environmental Justice Impacts (Demographics)		
Minority Within 1,400' Buffer – 1990 Population	0	0
Low Income Within 1,400' Buffer – 1990 Households	0	0
Farmland Impacts		
Total Acreage of Important Farmlands Within Station Area (Prime, Unique, and Statewide Importance)	153.17	485.1
	•	O
Minimize Impacts on Cultural Resources.		
Cultural Resources Impacts		
Number of National Register Resources Within Station Area	0	0



Evaluation Criteria	Fresno East	Fresno West
Parks & Recreation/Wildlife Refuge Impacts		
Total Acreage Parks/Recreation Areas in Station Area	0	0
Count of Parks/Recreation Areas	0	0
Maximize Avoidance of Areas with Geolog	ic and Soils Constraints.	
Soils/Slope Constraints		
Not a Distinguishing Factor		
Seismic Constraints		
Not a Distinguishing Factor		
Maximize Avoidance of Areas with Potenti	ial Hazardous Materials.	
Hazardous Materials/Waste Constraints		
Not a Distinguishing Factor		











Least Favorable

Most Favorable

Table 2-H-14 Sacramento to Bakersfield – High-Speed Train Alignment Evaluation Matrix Fresno to Tulare Alignment

Alignment = Alignment Carried Forward

Alignment = Alignment Eliminated

	UPRR	BNSF	E99	W99
Evaluation Criteria	(Downtown Fresno to	(Downtown Fresno to	(Fresno East to Tulare	(Downtown Fresno to
	Visalia Airport)	Hanford)	East County)	Tulare West County)
Maximize Ridership/Revenue Potential.				
Travel Time	VHS 13.2 minutes	VHS 11.3 minutes	VHS 13.9 minutes	VHS 13.0 minutes
	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Length	35.98 miles 57.90 km Not	28.85 miles 46.43 km Not	38.56 miles 62.06 km Not	34.99 miles 56.32 km Not
	Applicable	Applicable	Applicable	Applicable
Population/Employment Catchment	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Maximize Connectivity and Accessibility.	1	ı		
Intermodal Connections	*See Visalia Airport Station option	*See Hanford Station option	*See Tulare East County Station option	*See Tulare West County Station
	•	•	G	O
Minimize Operating and Capital Costs.				
Length	UP coordination	BNSF and Amtrak coordination	New right-of-way	UP coordination
	0	0	•	•
Operational Issues	UP coordination	BNSF and Amtrak coordination	New coordination	UP coordination
	•	•	•	•



	UPRR	BNSF	E99	W99
Evaluation Criteria	(Downtown Fresno to Visalia Airport)	(Downtown Fresno to Hanford)	(Fresno East to Tulare East County)	(Downtown Fresno to Tulare West County)
Construction Issues	Fresno downtown UP coordination	Fresno downtown BNSF and Amtrak coordination	New right-of-way	Fresno downtown UP coordination
	•	•	•	•
Capital Cost	High cost because of Fresno downtown and UP	Moderate to high cost because of Fresno Downtown but BN less costly	Moderate to high cost E99 right-of-way	Low cost
	0	•	•	
Right-of-Way Issues/Cost	Fresno downtown UP ROW High cost per mile	Fresno downtown BNSF and Amtrak ROW	Fresno downtown UP ROW High cost per mile	Fresno downtown UP ROW Low cost per mile
	O	•	•	•
Maximize Compatibility with Existing and	Planned Development.	1	.	<u> </u>
Land Use Compatibility and Conflicts				
Percent of Conflicting Existing Land Uses within adjacent buffers (Residences, Institutions, Recreation, Parks, and Open Space)	6.07	12.63	6.92	0.82
	•	•		
Visual Quality Impacts				
Scenic Corridor and River Crossings	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Minimize Impacts on Natural Resources.				
Water Resources Impacts				
Number of Natural Stream/Lake Crossings (linear ft)	10.00 (500)	6.00 (300)	13.00 (650)	4.00 (200)
Number of Wetland Crossings Total Acreage of Wetlands Within ROW	7.00 17.50	3.00 1.52	16.00 9.71	8.00 19.73
Total Acreage of Wellands Within ROW	17.50	1.52	9.71	19.73



Evaluation Criteria	UPRR (Downtown Fresno to Visalia Airport)	BNSF (Downtown Fresno to Hanford)	E99 (Fresno East to Tulare East County)	W99 (Downtown Fresno to Tulare West County)	
Floodplain Impacts					
Number of FEMA Floodplain Crossings	8.00	5.00	14.00	9.00	
Associated Length (meters) of Floodplain Crossings	12348.78	1644.41	11201.35	4347.91	
Total Acreage of FEMA Floodplain Crossings	87.51	7.50	84.02	28.05	
Threatened & Endangered Species Impacts	0		•	•	
Tilleatened & Endangered Species Impacts					
Count of Species w/in ROW	4.00	3.00	5.00	3.00	
Count of Species along ROW	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Sensitive Habitat Acreage w/in ROW	12.89	0.00	49.37	11.70	
Net Sensitive Habitat Acreage along ROW	38.74	0.00	148.10	35.10	
	•		0	•	
Minimize Impacts on Social and Economic	Resources.				
Environmental Justice Impacts (Demographics)					
Minority Within 1,400' Buffer – 1990 Population	21555.00	8786.00	11722.00	9473.00	
Low Income Within 1,400' Buffer – 1990 Households	158.00	158.00	0.00	158.00	
	•		•		
Farmland Impacts		*Medium severance impacts with alignment mostly along BNSF	*High severance impacts with "new" corridor	*High severance impacts with "new" corridor	
Total Acreage of Important Farmlands Within ROW (Prime, Unique, and Statewide Importance)	47.38	255.17	293.44	244.10	
		•	0	•	



Evaluation Criteria	UPRR (Downtown Fresno to	BNSF (Downtown Fresno to	E99 (Fresno East to Tulare	W99 (Downtown Fresno to
Evaluation Criteria	Visalia Airport)	Hanford)	East County)	Tulare West County)
Minimize Impacts on Cultural Resources.				•
Cultural Resources Impacts				
Number of National Register Resources Within ROW	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Number of National Register Resources along ROW	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Parks & Recreation/Wildlife Refuge Impacts				
Total Acreage Parks/Recreation Areas in ROW	0.00	0.60	0.43	0.00
Total Acreage of Parks/Recreation Areas along ROW	2.32	2.75	1.64	0.00
Incidences of Parks/Recreation Areas in ROW	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00
Incidences of Parks/Recreation Areas along ROW	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
		<u> </u>		
Maximize Avoidance of Areas with Geolog Soils/Slope Constraints	ic and Soils Constraints.	1		
Sonsy Stope constraints				
Not a Distinguishing Factor				
Seismic Constraints				
Not a Distinguishing Factor				
Maximize Avoidance of Areas with Potent.	l ial Hazardous Materials			
Hazardous Materials/Waste Constraints	ai Tiazai dodo iviatoriaio.			
Not a Distinguishing Factor				









Least Favorable

Most Favorable





Table 2-H-15 Sacramento to Bakersfield - High-Speed Train Station Evaluation Matrix **Tulare to Bakersfield Stations**

Station = Station Carried Forward

Station = Station Eliminated

Evaluation Criteria	Visalia Airport	Hanford	Tulare Airport	Tulare East	Tulare West		
Maximize Ridership/Revenue Potential.							
Travel Time	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable		
Length	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable		
Population/Employment Catchment				ther Tulare County Station tions			
	•	•	O	O	•		
Maximize Connectivity and Accessibility	tv.	•					
Intermodal Connections	Outlying location. Freeway access: SR 99 and SR 198 adjacent. Street access: local streets off freeway to airport. Parking adequate at shared airport sites. Transit: bus only. Other rail: none.	Suburban location in settled community. Freeway access: SR 198 ca ½ mile. Street access: Local city streets. Parking: limited at site. Transit: local Hanford transit good, long access routes from Visalia and other cities. Other rail: Amtrak connection.	 Outlying location. Freeway access: SR 99 adjacent. Street access: local streets off freeway to airport. Parking adequate at shared airport sites. Transit: none. Other rail: none. 	 Exurban site. Freeway access: close to conceptual SR 65 Freeway in future. Arterial access via SR 198. No transit access. 	 Suburban location. Freeway access: somewhat distant from SR 99. Arterial access from SR 198. No transit access. Ranking Relative to the other Tulare County Station Options		
	•	•	O	O	•		
Minimize Operating and Capital Costs.							
Length	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable			

Evaluation Criteria	Visalia Airport	Hanford	Tulare Airport	Tulare East	Tulare West
Operational Issues	Compatibility with UP freight	Compatibility with BNSF freight	Compatibility with UP freight	New greenfields site. No major issues, except distance from urban areas.	New greenfields site. No major issues.
	•	•	•	•	•
Construction Issues	Open site. Some flooding issues possible.	Interaction with freight railroads and Amtrak station operations.	Open site.	New greenfields site. No major issues.	New greenfields site. No major issues.
	•	•	•	•	
Capital Cost	Low	Low.	Low	Low	Low
	•	•		•	•
Right-of-Way Issues/Cost	City of Visalia owns land on both sides of freeway in vicinity of airport.I	RR right-of-way and adjacent uses.	Moderate.	Open agricultural land on new alignment of freeway.	New greenfields site on open agricultural land.
	•	•	•		
Maximize Compatibility with Existing an	nd Planned Development.			•	
Land Use Compatibility and Conflicts					
Percent of Conflicting Existing Land Uses (Residences, Institutions, Recreational Areas, and Open Space) within Station Area	34.54	67.18	25.85	6.59	3.99
Primary Land Uses (acreage) within station area	Farmlands/Agriculture (171); Open Space (63); Recreational (67); Transportation (133)	Commercial (94); Institutional (103); Office (56); Residential (235)	Farmlands/Agriculture (213); Industrial (144); Institutional (56); Residential (48)	Farmlands/Agriculture (468)	Farmlands/Agriculture (479)
	•	0	•	•	•
Visual Quality Impacts	-	-			
Percent of Visually Sensitive Existing Land Uses (Residential, Institutional, Recreational Areas, and Open Space)	34.54	67.18	25.85	6.59	3.99
Number of scenic corridor and scenic river crossings	0	0	O	1	0
	•	0	•	0	





Evaluation Criteria	Visalia Airport	Hanford	Tulare Airport	Tulare East	Tulare West
Minimize Impacts on Natural Resources.	l .				
Water Resources Impacts					
Number of Natural Stream	1	0	0	2	1
Number of Wetland Crossings	2	0	1	3	3
Total Acreage of Wetlands within Station Area	1.22	0	1.01	16.47	3.21
	0			lacksquare	•
Floodplain Impacts				<u> </u>	
Number of FEMA Floodplain Crossings	2	0	1	1	1
Total Acreage of FEMA Floodplain Crossings within Station Area	387.21	0	146.13	351.98	131.13
	0			0	
Threatened & Endangered Species Impacts					
Count of Species	0	0	1	3	4
Acreage of Sensitive Habitat within Station Area	0	0	o O	329.7	0
Minimize Impacts on Social and Econom	nic Resources.		J		
Environmental Justice Impacts (Demographics)					
Minority Within 1,400' Buffer – 1990 Population	0	0	0	0	728
Low Income Within 1,400' Buffer – 1990					
Households	0	0	0	0	0



Evaluation Criteria	Visalia Airport	Hanford	Tulare Airport	Tulare East	Tulare West
Farmland Impacts					
Total Acreage of Important Farmlands Within Station Area (Prime, Unique, and Statewide Importance)	0	0	0	0	0
Minimize Impacts on Cultural Resources					
Cultural Resources Impacts					
Number of National Register Resources Within Station Area	0	0	0	0	0
Parks & Recreation/Wildlife Refuge Impacts					
Total Acreage Parks/Recreation Areas in Station Area	0	0	1	1	0
Count of Parks/Recreation Areas	0	0	0.37	109.47	0
	•		•	O	
Maximize Avoidance of Areas with Geolo	ogic and Soils Constraints.				
Soils/Slope Constraints					
Not a Distinguishing Factor					



Evaluation Criteria	Visalia Airport	Hanford	Tulare Airport	Tulare East	Tulare West
Seismic Constraints					
Not a Distinguishing Factor					
Maximize Avoidance of Areas with Pote	ntial Hazardous Materials	S.			
Hazardous Materials/Waste Constraints					
Not a Distinguishing Factor					

Least Favorable



Most Favorable



Table 2-H-16 Sacramento to Bakersfield – High-Speed Train Alignment Evaluation Matrix __Tulare to Bakersfield Alignment

Alignment = Alignment Carried Forward

Alignment = Alignment Eliminated

	BNSF	UPRR	E99	W99
Evaluation Criteria	(Hanford to Bakersfield Truxton)	(Visalia Airport to Bakersfield Golden State)	(Tulare East County to Bakersfield Golden State)	(Tulare West County to Bakersfield Golden State)
Maximize Ridership/Revenue Potential.				
Travel Time	VHS 25.7 minutes	VHS 22.3 minutes	VHS 22.4 minutes	VHS 22.5 minutes
	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Length	81.70 miles 131.48 km	69.23 miles 111.41 km	69.73 miles 112.22 km	70.06 miles 112.75 km
	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Population/Employment Catchment	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Maximize Connectivity and Accessibility				
Intermodal Connections	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Minimize Operating and Capital Costs.				
Length	BNSF ROW	UP ROW	E99 and UP ROW	UP and new ROW
	•	•	•	•
Operational Issues	BNSF coordination	UP coordination	UP coordination	UP coordination
	0	•	•	•
Construction Issues	BNSF ROW	UP ROW Bakersfield downtown	UP ROW Bakersfield suburbs	UP ROW
	•	O	•	•



Evaluation Criteria	BNSF (Hanford to Bakersfield	UPRR (Visalia Airport to	E99 (Tulare East County to	W99 (Tulare West County to
	Truxton)	Bakersfield Golden State)	Bakersfield Golden State)	Bakersfield Golden State)
Capital Cost	High cost BN right of way	High cost UP right of way	Moderate costs	Moderate to high costs
		•	•	•
Right-of-Way Issues/Cost	BNSF ROW	UP ROW Bakersfield downtown	UP ROW Bakersfield suburbs	UP ROW
	•	•	•	•
Maximize Compatibility with Existing an	nd Planned Development.			
Land Use Compatibility and Conflicts				
Percent of Conflicting Existing Land Uses within adjacent buffers (Residences, Institutions, Recreation, Parks, and Open Space)	11.62	12.73	4.70	8.01
				4
Visual Quality Impacts	•			
Scenic Corridor and River Crossings	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00
Minimize Impacts on Natural Resources				
Water Resources Impacts				
Number of Natural Stream/Lake Crossings (linear ft)	9.00 (450)	8.00 (400)	9.00 (450)	12.00 (600)
Number of Wetland Crossings	25.00	26.00	15.00	21.00
Total Acreage of Wetlands Within ROW	45.50	7.35	8.92	30.93
	\cup			
Floodplain Impacts				
Number of FEMA Floodplain Crossings	11.00	8.00	12.00	10.00
Associated Length (meters) of Floodplain Crossings	19851.62	34332.27	19403.64	22835.27
Total Acreage of FEMA Floodplain Crossings	152.31	226.41	145.50	169.89
		•		

Evaluation Criteria	BNSF (Hanford to Bakersfield Truxton)	UPRR (Visalia Airport to Bakersfield Golden State)	E99 (Tulare East County to Bakersfield Golden State)	W99 (Tulare West County to Bakersfield Golden State)
Threatened & Endangered Species Impacts				
Count of Species w/in ROW	28.00	23.00	6.00	16.00
Count of Species along ROW	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00
Sensitive Habitat Acreage w/in ROW	26.49	2.51	4.96	20.15
Net Sensitive Habitat Acreage along ROW	101.26	18.20	25.53	71.03
	lacksquare			
Minimize Impacts on Social and Econom	nic Resources.	•		
Environmental Justice Impacts (Demographics)				
Minority Within 1,400' Buffer – 1990 Population	24023.00	35551.00	3843.00	11609.00
Low Income Within 1,400' Buffer – 1990 Households	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	0			
Farmland Impacts	*Low severance impacts along existing BNSF alignment		*High severance impacts with "new" corridor	*High severance impacts with "new" corridor
Total Acreage of Important Farmlands Within ROW (Prime, Unique, and Statewide Importance)	433.88	166.21	252.83	262.88
The portained by			<u> </u>	4
Minimize Impacts on Cultural Resources	<u> </u>			
Cultural Resources Impacts				
Number of National Register Resources Within ROW	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Number of National Register Resources along ROW	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	•			

